



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/530,122	04/20/2000	HIROKI NAKAHARA	9319S-000126	2816

7590 11/15/2004  
HARNES DICKY & PIERCE  
P O BOX 828  
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

QI, ZHI QIANG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/530,122

Applicant(s)

NAKAHARA ET AL.

Examiner

Mike Qi

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 23-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 23-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.



### DETAILED ACTION

The previous final rejection has been withdrawn according to the English Translation of the priority document in order to apply the priority filing date of August 31, 1998. The new reference Forgetter has a filing date before the priority filing date.

The independent claims 1, 10, 17, 23 and 24 have been amended, and new claims 25-26 have been added.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of US 6,507,381 (Katsuya et al) and US 5,317,434 (Ohara).

Claim 10, AAPA discloses (page 1, line 10 – page 4, line 21; Figs.11-12) that a liquid crystal panel comprising:

- a first substrate (1);
- first electrodes (6A) formed on an inner side of the first substrate (1);
- a first alignment layer (13) formed on the first electrodes (6A);
- a second substrate (2);
- a second electrodes (7A) formed on an inner side of the second substrate (2);



- a second alignment layer (23) formed on the second electrodes (7A);
- the first electrodes (6A) and the second electrodes (7A) must have terminals formed on the first and second substrates (1,2) for conducting between the first and second electrodes (6A, 7A);
- a sealant (3) coupled between the first and the second substrates so as to form a gap therebetween.

AAPA does not explicitly disclose that each of the alignment layers is formed on and cover an inner region delimited by the sealant; the alignment layer is formed from the inner region to an intermediate portion of a sealant region where the sealant is formed, along a side of the sealant with the terminals; and the alignment layer crosses over the sealant region to an outer side of the sealant along a side of the sealant other than the side with the terminals.

However, Katsuya discloses (col.4, line 59 – col.8, line 3; Fig.2) that a structure of a liquid crystal panel (10) in which the alignment films (12a,12b) cover the inner region delimited by the sealant (15), and such construction of the liquid crystal panel make it possible to miniaturize the liquid crystal panel itself.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to arrange the alignment films cover the inner region delimited by the sealant for achieving miniaturized liquid crystal panel.

Still lacking limitation is such that the alignment layer is formed from the inner region to an intermediate portion of a sealant region along a side of the sealant with the



terminals; and the alignment layer crosses over the sealant region to an outer side of the sealant along a side of the sealant other than the side with the terminals.

However, Ohara discloses (col.2, lines14-36; Fig.2) that the orientation film (5) is formed so that it extends outside the region which underlies the opposing substrate, or in other words, the orientation film (5) extends beyond the area defined by the overlap of the two substrates. The two substrates are bonded by the sealant, so that the orientation film (5) is formed from the inner region to an intermediate portion of the sealant and crosses over the sealant region to an outside of the sealant. Because the alignment film has a rectangle shape, so that one side of the alignment layer must be along a side of the sealant with terminals and one side of the alignment film without terminals. Ohara indicates (col.2, lines 24-36) that the extended portion of the orientation layer functions as a protective layer for the signal input portion of the electrode (terminals), thus, electric corrosion reactions are prevented and disconnection of the electrode is thereby avoided, and reliability is enhanced.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to arrange the alignment film extending outside to prevent the electric corrosion reaction and enhancing the reliability.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to arrange the alignment layers to cover and to cross the sealant forming region as claimed in claim 10 for miniaturizing the liquid crystal panel and enhancing the reliability.



3. Claims 1,17, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art (AAPA) US 6,507,381 (Katsuya et al) and US 5,317,434 (Ohara) as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of US 5,818,625 (Forgette et al).

Claims 1,17, 23 and 24, lacking limitation is such that the terminals being connected through a conductive particle included in the sealant.

However, Forgette discloses (col.56, line 66 – col.16, line 53; Fig.5a) that the sealing member (116) comprises a typical sealing material such as epoxy (116a) with conductive particles (116b) contained therein so as to ensure sufficient conductivity between the reflector/electrode area (120a) and the transparent conductive material (128), i.e., to ensure the conductivity between the two electrodes with terminals.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to arrange a conductive particles included in the sealant as claimed in claims 1, 17, 23 and 24 for achieving a sufficient conductivity between the two electrodes with terminals.

4. Claims 2-9, 11-16, 18-21 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA, Katsuya, Ohara and Forgette as applied to claims 1, 10, 17, 23 and 24 above, and further in view of US 5,150,239 (Watanabe et al).

Claim 2, lacking limitation is such that the sealant is a one-part thermosetting epoxy sealant.

However, Watanabe discloses (col.1, lines 14-35) that a one-pack type or single-liquid type epoxy resin adhesive (such as one-pack type thermosetting epoxy adhesive)



has been conventionally used as an adhesive for constituting a sealant for liquid crystal cells, because of its high strength and excellent heat resistance, chemical resistance and moisture resistance, etc.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to use one-part thermosetting epoxy as a sealant as claimed in claim 2 for achieving high strength and excellent heat resistance, chemical resistance and moisture resistance, etc.

Claims 3-4, lacking limitation is such that the alignment layer is formed up to a region overlapping the sealant forming regions.

However, as the explanation of Katsuya above, the rectangular substrates have four sides, so that the sealant must be deposited corresponding to at least three sides of the substrates (one side would be used for the input-output terminals and terminals for conducting between substrates, i.e., the electrical wirings) and the alignment layer formed up to edges of the substrate so as to conducting the liquid crystal to display image efficiently.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to arrange the sealant corresponding to four sides of the substrates or at least three sides excluding one side for the electrical wirings as claimed in claims 3-4 for achieving good sealing between the substrates and display image efficiently.

Claim 5, the limitations are the same as the claim 4. Therefore, claim 5 is redundant.

Claims 6-9, using product-by-process limitations, but the patentability is based on the product itself (see MPEP 2113).



AAPA discloses (Figs.11-12) that the electrodes (7A) are formed on the surface of a large substrate (2) for forming a plurality of pair of substrates (1A,2A) along cutting projection lines (L1,L2).

Lacking limitation is such that the alignment layers are formed overlapping the sealant including the cutting projection lines.

However, Katsuya discloses (Fig.2) that the alignment layers are formed to overlap the sealant forming region other than the region for conducting between the substrate, and overlapping the edge portion of the sealant (the cutting projection lines), and alignment films would be formed in strips along the cutting projection line, as the explanation of Katsuya above, and that would have been at least obvious as to miniaturize the liquid crystal panel itself.

Claims 11-14, lacking limitation is such that the alignment films are interposed between the sealant and the substrate, and extend to the perimeter of the substrate.

However, Katsuya discloses (Fig.2) that the first alignment layer (12a) is interposed between the sealant (15) and the first substrate (11a); the second alignment layer (12b) is interposed between the sealant (15) and the second substrate (11b); the first alignment layer (12a) extends to a perimeter of the first substrate (11a); and the second alignment layer (12b) extends to a perimeter of the second substrate (11b). As the explanation of the Katsuya above, such structure of liquid crystal panel would miniaturize the liquid crystal panel, and the display area would be utilized efficiently, and it would enlarge the image display region.



Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled at the time the invention was made to arrange the alignment layers as claimed in claims 11-14 for miniaturizing the liquid crystal panel and efficiently utilizing the display area.

Claim 15, AAPA discloses (Fig.12) that the rectangular substrates have four sides, and one side would be used for the input-output terminals, i.e., the electrical wirings.

Claim 16, AAPA discloses (Fig.11) that a first transparent insulating film (12) interposed between the first alignment layer (13) and the first substrate (1) over the first electrodes (6A); a second transparent insulating film (22) interposed between the second alignment layer (23) and the second substrate (2) over the second electrode (7A); and the Fig.11B shows the first and second transparent insulation films (12,22) are complementing a configuration of the first and second alignment layers (13,23).

Claims 18-19, lacking limitation is such that the alignment layer overlaps the sealing region and the cutting lines.

However, Katsuya discloses (Fig.2) that a structure of a liquid crystal panel in which the alignment film (12b) is deposited to overlap the sealing deposit region (15) and extends to the edge portion of the panel, so that the alignment film (12b) is also overlap the plurality of projected cutting lines. As the explanation of the Katsuya above, such structure of liquid crystal panel would miniaturize the liquid crystal panel, and the display area would be utilized efficiently, and it would enlarge the display area.



Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled at the time the invention was made to arrange the alignment layers as claimed in claims 18-19 for miniaturizing the liquid crystal panel and efficiently utilizing the display area.

Claim 20, AAPA discloses (Fig.11-12) that to bond the substrates must deposit the sealant on the sealant deposit region, and it is a conventional in the art to deposit the sealant on each smaller substrate, since that would achieve a stronger bonding.

Claim 21, AAPA discloses (Figs.11-12) that bonding the pair of large substrates by sealant (3) along each small substrate; cutting the pair of substrates along the projecting cutting lines (L1, L2).

Claims 25-26, lacking limitation is such that a transparent insulating film formed on the electrodes to cover the inner region delimited by the sealant; and the alignment layer is formed on the transparent insulation film; and the transparent insulating film and the alignment layer are formed from the inner region to an intermediate portion of a sealant region along a side with terminals, and cross over the sealant region to an outside of the sealant along a side other than the terminals.

However, Watanabe discloses (col.3, lines 17-29; col.1, lines 30-35; Fig.1) that an insulating layer (104) and an alignment film (105) formed on the electrodes (102) to cover the inner region delimited by the sealant (106); and the alignment layer (105) is formed on the insulation layer (104); and the rectangular substrates having four sides, and the electrical wire terminals on one side, so that the sealant must have one side with terminals. Such that the insulation layer (104) and the alignment layer (105) are formed from the inner region to an intermediate portion of a sealant region (106) along



one side with terminals and cross over the sealant (106) along the side other than the side with terminals as shown in the Fig.1. Watanabe indicates (col.1, lines 3-35) that the pair of substrates superposed in alignment with each other and followed by pressing bonding, and using such structure (the alignment film and the insulation film cross over the sealant region) would effectively achieve the pressure bonding for pressing the sealant to provide the entire panel having uniform gap.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to arrange transparent insulation film and alignment layer as claimed in claims 25-26 for achieving an entire uniform gap between substrates.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10, 17 and 23-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not



Art Unit: 2871

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Qi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2299. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 8:00 am-5:00 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim can be reached on (571) 272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



Art Unit: 2871

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mike Qi  
November 8, 2004



TARIFUR R. CHOWDHURY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER